

10-30-1978

Hastings Law News Vol.11 No.4

UC Hastings College of the Law

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.uchastings.edu/hln>

Recommended Citation

UC Hastings College of the Law, "Hastings Law News Vol.11 No.4" (1978). *Hastings Law News*. Book 106.
<http://repository.uchastings.edu/hln/106>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the UC Hastings Archives and History at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hastings Law News by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.



Hastings Law News

The University of California Hastings College of the Law

VOLUME XI NUMBER IV

SAN FRANCISCO

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1978

Centennial Dinner

Hastings College of Law, the oldest law school west of the Mississippi River, celebrated its centennial anniversary last week with a gala dinner party at the St. Francis Hotel. The dinner was attended by nearly seven hundred persons. The keynote speaker was New York Senator Daniel P. Moynihan. The guest speaker was United States Ambassador-at-Large, Elliot Richardson.

The first annual Hastings Medals of distinguished Citizenship were presented to Hastings Professor and former Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court, Roger J. Traynor and President Emeritus of the University of California, Charles J. Hitch. The presentations were made by the Honorable A. Frank Bray, Chairman of the Board of Directors, Hastings College.

Prior to the dinner, a private reception was held in the State Suite for dignitaries and other guests made possible through the generosity of Professor Peter K. Maier and Mr. Alfred Fromm, founder of the Fromm Foundation. Professor Maier and Mr. Fromm also contributed the entire selection of wine and champagne served during the dinner. The recep-

tion was attended by nearly one hundred persons including Dean and Mrs. Marvin J. Anderson, Dean David Concepcion Mr. Harold S. Dobbs, Mr. and Mrs. Fromm, Mr. Harry H. Hastings, Mr. and Mrs. Max Jamison, Professor and Mrs. Maier, Dr. and Mrs. Mehmet Sherif, Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Shorenstein, and Professor and Mrs. Jack Werchick.

The general reception which followed offered all guests the opportunity to intermingle and exchange pleasantries before the one hundred twenty five dollar per person and thirty five dollar per student dinner. A feeling of great warmth towards Hastings College and the Centennial Celebration was apparent throughout the evening.

Proceeds from the dinner will apply towards meeting requirements for a Kresge Foundation grant. The Kresge Foundation offered Hastings one year in which to raise three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. When the money is raised, Hastings will be the recipient of an identical sum from the foundation. The Kresge grant will be the largest private foundation grant in Hastings history.



Dean Marvin J. Anderson, Elliot L. Richardson and Daniel P. Moynihan

The successful grant proposal and many behind the scenes efforts were provided by Hastings Development Officer Ester Heinsen and her staff.

Stein Wins 1st Prize

Ira Stein of Encino, California, has won the \$250 First Prize in the Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition at the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, President Stanley Adams of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers announced recently. The competition at the University of California was under the supervision of Dean Marvin J. Anderson, and the title of the winning essay was "The California Resale Royalties Act; A Legal Odyssey Begins." Mr. Stein was the only entrant in the Hastings competition.

Before his law school studies, Mr. Stein received a Bachelor of Arts from Pomona College. At Hastings College of the Law, University of California, he was Managing Editor of the Hastings Law News and is a member of the Hastings International and Comparative Law Review. He is the son of Tobi Stein of Encino and Louis Fishstein of Agoura.

The Nathan Burkan Memorial Competition is sponsored annually by ASCAP, performing rights licensing organization, in memory of ASCAP's first General Counsel who died in 1936. It is designed to stimulate interest in the field of copyright law. First and second prizes of \$250 and \$100 are offered in each of the leading law schools throughout the nation. A panel of distinguished judges then considers all the prize-winning papers which are received from participating law schools, and selects the outstanding essays for National Awards of \$1500, \$1000, \$750, \$500 and \$250.

Cafeteria Theft Rises



Dennis and Tim at their cafeteria in the Commons

During the spring semester of 1978, the Dennis and Tim's Cafeteria in the Commons reported losses due to student theft as high as fifty dollars per day, the highest theft rate they had experienced at Hastings. In order to prevent further abuse, they hired a plain clothes guard. The cost of the guard approximately equalled the losses from student theft. The net effect was a daily loss to the concession of roughly one hundred dol-

lars a day.

In further response to the sudden theft increase, Dennis and Tim resorted to the application of academic sanctions through the office of Student Affairs. When a student was caught stealing, he or she was taken before Dean Peterson, and a note could then be placed in the student's scholastic files for later review by the Bar. Such sanctions were disliked by Dennis and Tim who feel no animosity

toward students they serve. Dennis reports instances when he has loaned money to his many student friends who did not have money to pay for their meals, and of the many times that he has given food to students who would have otherwise gone without. Last year, the guard caught a student who Dennis knew. Contingent upon the promise that the student never repeat such pilferage, Dennis let the student go. Dennis reports that the same student was caught stealing again in the same semester.

This year, theft was of little problem until last week when it jumped to twenty dollars a day. However, Dennis fears that even this rate of stealing coupled with a possible increase in rent on his concession in the Commons will force him to increase his prices. Neither Dennis or Tim desire to increase the cost of the food they prepare. They wish to maintain their low prices so students on limited budgets may eat well.

In order to hold the line on food prices at the Commons concession, Dennis and Tim appeal to all Hastings students to help stop theft by reporting to them anyone whom they see stealing. Names of students who report such incidents will not be disclosed.

Plastic Money -

A Student Guide

By Stephen E. Taylor

The previous article in the October 16th issue of *LAW NEWS* explained the creation and expansion of the Bank Card Network. This article discusses the authorization process and the attitudes of local banks towards Hastings students.

As of this writing the VISA and MASTERCHARGE networks are in a struggle for dominance of the Bank Card industry. As part of long-range expansion plans both cards are attempting to establish their cards as check-substitutes. So far Arizona seems to have the oldest and largest checking account debit card program using VISA. One of the largest banks there mass-mailed 110,000+ cards to its checking account customers. The card fills the gap left by customers who don't want to be billed for purchases but who appreciate the unquestioned acceptance of a VISA card.

MasterCharge is having a few problems. First of all the MasterCharge network has many different names around the world such as ACCESS, EUROCARD and others. These non-USA cards bear no resemblance at all to the MasterCharge design. To complicate matters further MasterCharge has longer account numbers and when it unveiled its debit card the industry found that MasterCharge was creating an entirely new card, one with new colors and a new name. The name is "Signet." To my knowledge no bank has agreed to issue it yet. The MasterCharge card itself has not been used to access checking account funds since it is thought that because MasterCharge contains the word "Charge" the connotation of borrowing money would turn off the very people the card would be sold to—the person who doesn't want to use credit but would like a more acceptable payment method than checks.

VISA is making most of the inroads lately and the gamble they took on the name change idea is a key part of the planning. The word VISA doesn't offend anyone and the association is free to make of it what they will. VISA has signed up Savings and Loan Associations around the country while MasterCharge long insisted that only Commercial Banks could join (MasterCharge has now signed up State Savings of California). VISA has signed up two nationwide retailers, Pay 'N' Save and Budget Rent-A-Car, as well as the California State Triple A. The theory with CSAAA is that they might issue its Automobile Association Membership Card as a VISA card and thus get a new source of revenue while making membership more desirable to potential members. When these arrangements have been put into effect the plan could be duplicated with other associations. Waiting in the wings are the small loan companies and the thrift companies who could presumably qualify because several credit unions have already joined VISA and started issuing cards.

So far MasterCharge has been silent about admitting non-commercial bank institutions. Since State Savings was allowed to join I assume other

savings and loans may come in also, but there is no evidence of this locally.

VISA employees claim that they are on the way up and MasterCharge is on the way out. But that remains to be seen. I doubt that the two organizations would merge due to implications of antitrust violations that would surely follow. VISA shows no sign of needing MasterCharge for anything. VISA has its own satellite-linked bases for interchange (settling drafts among the various card issuing members); two are in North America and others are abroad. Should either of the American bases cease operation the other could handle all of the American traffic. VISA will not discuss the exact locations of any of the clearinghouses. All nightly clearing is done by microwave transmission, satellite, or leased land lines to the various member processing stations. Some West Coast institutions use processing facilities in Omaha, for example. It is possible for a Bank of America card, used in London, to have a London transaction posted at the Van Ness Street Bank-Americard center the day after the London merchant makes his bank deposit. Neither distance nor currency conversion will delay a transaction being posted with VISA. Under optimal conditions the bill for the London purchase may be waiting at home when the traveller returns. The most attractive point of the network is that the issuer of the card has control over the cards, not the network. There are no system-wide rules on approving applicants or on credit limits.

Every time "authorization" is obtained on your card your card issuer's computer is consulted. For example, assume you are in Tahoe standing in line to buy ski lift tickets. You present your VISA card issued by CITYCORP of New York for the lift ticket. The clerk keys the card number into a Texas Instruments terminal which may be tied into Wells Fargo Bank's computer in San Francisco which will recognize from the first four digits of the card account number that it belongs to CITYCORP. The amount of the request together with the account number of the card is switched to a

New York link (microwave or satellite) and is received in New York either by CITYCORP itself or a computer bureau run by an association of New York issuers. The request is routed to CITYCORP's VISA computer section which verifies that the account number is genuine and subtracts the requested amount from available funds. If available funds on the card will cover the purchase that figure is then decremented to reflect the lift ticket purchase. An approval is flashed back to Wells Fargo's San Francisco Center which in turn relays to the Texas Instruments terminal at the ski resort. The whole process takes less than eight seconds on a good day. During Christmas rush it can slow down to 30 seconds. If CITYCORP considered you to be up to your limit on the card a denial would have come back equally fast. If the card is reported lost or stolen or is "over-limit", various procedures come into play. An attempt to send the police to the place the card is being used is frequently made and sometimes the person concerned can be delayed long enough to be arrested. The computers alert operators that a stolen card is being used (or even worse, a counterfeit card) and they can call the salesclerk or wait for her to call the referral code given by the terminal. The clerk is asked to write down identification and description of the individual and to attempt to confiscate the card. The authorization operators are simultaneously calling the local police. The thief usually gets

away, but minus the card, leaving behind a sample of his/her writing, and a salesclerk who might be able to identify the person to the police. The salesclerk receives a check in the mail a week or two later for \$25. This encourages clerks to follow procedure and seek authorization not normally required until they become suspicious. As stated in the last article the card need not be reported lost. The issuer's computers are programmed to react if a card suddenly acts out of character and are especially sensitive to repeated purchases in a short time. Many issuers program computers to refer authorization requests to operators the first time a newly mailed card is used if the use is for a substantial sum. This is to protect against mailbox or post office theft by establishing that the intended customer got the card. This procedure can be restricted to those customers living in certain problem zip codes.

Hastings students who desire a VISA and/or MASTERCHARGE card should have little difficulty obtaining one from local banks such as Wells Fargo and Security Pacific. As a Hastings student, many banks issue cards without certain requirements that you might have to meet if you were not in school. In the days when some banks were compiling zip codes to which they would not mail cards, Bank of America began offering cards to students. Students are typically unemployed, transient, unestab-

Please Turn to Page 11

Hastings Bookstore

**HORN BOOKS
GILBERTS
BANKAMERICARD
MASTER CHARGE**



... ask Peg

PAPER DEPOT
288 GOLDEN GATE
SAN FRANCISCO

QUALITY FOR OFFSET PRINTING

FOR DELIVERY

FOR XEROX FORMS

FOR COPIES COPIES COPIES COPIES COPIES COPIES COPIES

FOR TYPESETTING

FOR BLUE PRINTS

FOR SPEED one day service

PRICE \$

776-9240

COMMERCIAL ACCOUNTS

CHARGE IT

W F Tu Th S
9:30 - 6:00
9:30 - 9:00
12 5:30

There Ought to be a Law:

You and Proposition U

By C. Eric Munson

There are several interesting and potentially important issues on this year's general election ballot. One of the most controversial is San Francisco's so-called rent rebate initiative, Proposition U. Several other bay area cities have similar measures on their ballots, and Los Angeles recently began a period of rent rollbacks and controls under a city ordinance similar to our proposed laws.

The initiatives and Los Angeles's city ordinance all begin by declaring their intentions to rescue poor renters from the jaws of greedy landlords, stating that there are shortages of rental units, rising and exorbitant rents, and that landlords are now earning reasonable and just rates of return on their investments. They then outline a system of "Regulated Rental Units," "Base Rents," "Adjusted Base Rents," and methods for calculating each rental unit's share of the property tax saving. They all work essentially the same way, imposing a short freeze on rents, with a rebate of any tax reductions resulting from Article XIIIa of the California Constitution. None of the measures advertises itself as rent controls, while almost all of the opponents claim that the effects, if not the intent, will be identical to rent controls. Most of the arguments on both sides have been biased and inaccurate; there are good and bad points to be considered in casting a vote for or against the proposals.

The first point to be made is that the initiatives are rent control measures. A few quotes from the San Francisco initiative will demonstrate this point, notwithstanding one judge's opinion to the contrary. Its statement of purpose clearly outlines the reasons for the rebates, concluding with the words, "landlords will be required to pass on to residential and commercial tenants the reduction in real property taxes established by Article XIIIa of the California Constitution" (emphasis added). Section 4 of the proposal states that for the month of December, "a landlord may not charge a rent in excess of the base rent," and that for the calendar year 1979 "landlords may not charge a rent in excess of the Adjusted Base Rent," as calculated pursuant to the ordinance. Section 6 details the amounts by which landlords may raise rents during the periods of rent controls, and Section 10(a) provides for civil remedies for tenants if "a landlord demands, accepts, receives, or retains any payment in excess of the maximum lawful rent permitted by this ordinance . . ." (emphasis added). Clearly, the proposed ordinance would control rents in San Francisco for at least the year ending December 31, 1979.

The most common arguments against rent controls center on their removal of the profit motive for construction of new housing and the maintenance of existing units. If rents are held too low, property owners will build dwellings for sale or convert rental units to condominiums or other owner-occupied units, making the shortage of rental units more severe than before. San Francisco's proposed ordinance would allow owners to add the costs of increased taxes, operating expenses, and improvements to the

rent on the pro-rated basis. The proponents of the initiative claim this guarantees a just and reasonable rate of return to landlords. Rents may be raised pursuant to Section 6 only if the landlord gives notice to tenants of the costs "justifying" the increased rents. The proposal provides for treble damages plus reasonable attorneys' fees, plus criminal penalties of up to \$3000 for willful violations.

The effects of price controls can be far-reaching, especially for housing. Economic theory predicts that any property tax savings will eventually be passed through to renters as competition among landlords causes rents to fall (or to rise less rapidly during inflationary times). But the competitive process takes time to work itself out, and in the meantime landlords are receiving windfall profits as their rental income exceeds their costs. The rent rebate ordinance attempts to speed up the competitive process by forcing landlords to reduce rents immediately, in the hope that they will not raise rents after controls are lifted.

Most of the arguments in favor of Proposition U are based on the theory that there is a continual "war" between landlords and tenants, and that the only chance for tenants is to pass laws forcing landlords to grant relief. Proponents point to the large number of landlords who have raised rents in the wake of Proposition 13 as proof that tenants will not enjoy any of the property tax savings unless rent rebate ordinances are passed. Examples of old ladies living on fixed incomes, welfare or disability cases, or other persons of limited means being "gouged" by unscrupulous landlords are being presented as reasons to take away landlords' powers to destroy lives. Why should landlords receive the entire benefits of Article XIIIa when so many tenants are more deserving?

Arguments against Proposition U are little better. Most center on the specter of abandoned buildings and new slums as a result of rent controls. Problems of cities such as New York are blamed exclusively on the imposition of rent controls. Those against rent controls argue that if we allow controls for one year we will almost certainly be faced with controls indefinitely, citing previous examples of "temporary" rent controls that became permanent. And when controls are permanent, they argue, property owners have no incentive to improve their buildings. Soon apartment buildings will begin to decay, and without improvements, they will become new slums. As those who can afford to move leave the city, the tax base will be eroded, and San Francisco will end up in the same position as New York. All this from just one law!

As I hope you have gathered by now, almost all the arguments on both sides of the issue have been attempts to convince people to vote one way or the other. As a biased observer, I hope to be able to present some of the most important arguments for and against Proposition U and its relatives, without the scare tactics and half-truths employed by those who stand to gain or lose significant amounts if the proposal becomes a law.

Proposition U may or may not increase the likelihood that tenants will receive some of the tax savings from Article XIIIa. Which parties receive what portion of the savings depend on several factors. First, if a tenant's rent on June 6, 1978 was high, Proposition U will not lower that rent to the point where the landlord is receiving only a "fair" return on the property. If the return was relatively high on June 6, it will remain relatively high. If a new tenant had just moved in, the probability is that the rent was relatively high, for landlords tend to raise rents when tenants leave rather than causing current tenants to move by raising their rents. Thus, owners of buildings with high turnover rates are likely to fare better than owners of other buildings.

The benefits also depend on the improvements made on the property during 1979. If the owner was contemplating improvements that would be profitable only if the costs could be recovered within, say, two years, but expected some argument as to the "reasonably expected life" of the improvement, they might be postponed until after the ordinance lapses in 1980. Meanwhile, tenants may be living in poorly maintained or dangerous apartments.

On the other hand, suppose an owner determined that there was a demand for more luxurious apartments than were presently offered in a certain building. The rent controls could then be circumvented by "improving" the apartments and raising rents to whatever level could be "justified" by the improvements. The result might very well be the disappearance of moderately-priced rental units as owners find that the only way to earn a competitive profit is to rent to more affluent tenants at higher prices. Those that did not want to pay those prices might literally have no place to go, since rent controls would have discouraged the construction of new rental units. This type of effect should be expected only in the long run. If the proposed ordinance is allowed to lapse at the end of 1979, we should see owners putting off improvements rather than "overimproving" their property.

The point is that part of the reason people rent apartments to others is that they expect to profit as a result of taking a risk. If we take away the opportunity of a windfall through rent controls, we will discourage such risk-takers; they will have nothing to gain but a real possibility of loss. The discouragement effect will keep new rental units from being constructed. It will also cause conversion of existing units to owner-occupied housing. Owner-occupation will allow the possibility of large profits as homes appreciate over time. Rental units provide part of their return from appreciation, but the rate of return is also sensitive to the rent that can be charged for the apartments; if the maximum rent is too low, fewer persons will be willing to invest in housing units, and the shortage of housing in San Francisco will worsen.

The arguments above apply only to long term rent controls. Since the proposed ordinance would only last one year, most of the ill effects would

not have time to develop. We should not expect large movements toward condominiums solely as a result of the rent controls during 1979. We should not expect slums to pop up where they did not already exist. We should not expect to see owners driving their tenants out by making extravagant "improvements" to their property. All of these effects would take much longer than one year of rent controls. During the one year proposed by Proposition U, we should expect to see at most a moratorium on improvements to existing units and a marked reduction in sales of existing apartment buildings. We should also expect that soon after the controls are lifted, rents will rise, perhaps more rapidly than they have been rising recently. Thus, *as proposed*, the ordinance would have few effects in the long run. We could look back in ten years and wonder what all the commotion was about.

The principal danger of Proposition U, however, is the likelihood that it will be renewed in 1980. There are several reasons to believe that once passed it will assume a permanent part of San Francisco politics. First, few of the harmful effects of rent controls will be apparent at the end of its first year in operation. Most voters will see only that their rents have risen little if at all during 1979. The gradual deterioration of their apartments and the reluctance of their landlords to make necessary improvements will not be noticeable for some time. The gradual trend to convert existing apartments to condominiums will be hard to detect until several years have passed, as will the trend to overimprove or to construct housing for owner occupation rather than rental units. By the time these harmful effects of rent controls have surfaced, they may no longer be associated with rent controls. The lifting of controls may not be considered, or if it is, it will receive intense opposition from tenants who stand to lose their protected position of paying low rents. The unfair advantage will have been given to current tenants; would-be renters will have no way to compete since they will be prohibited from offering higher rents, while landlords will be stuck with buildings that pay low returns.

I have purposely refrained from discussing the probable effects of rent controls on attorneys' incomes. It seems appropriate to expect, however, that any law (particularly one requiring many judgements as to what constitutes "fair" rent increases due to increased costs) would increase the demand for legal services. Today, if my landlord raises my rent, I can pay, move out, or try to organize other renters to convince the owner of his folly. Under rent controls, my first move would more likely be to call my lawyer. If I were a lawyer (or a law student) I would most certainly vote for Proposition U, as my income would almost certainly rise. More and more renters would be coming to me with their complaints that the rent increases were not justified by the improvements or that the improvements were designed solely for the

Please Turn to Page 8, Col. 1

Behind the Scenes...

By Allen R. King

At the ASH Meeting held on Friday the 13th of October, newest AS member Ed Wallace made an auspicious speaking debut before the vote on his confirmation as third year rep. In his maiden address to the council, he started with a criticism of ASH, then one minute later, praised ASH. As one member noted, "Anyone who can in one breath criticize ASH, and then in the next praise it, proves he's politician enough to take a seat in this august body." (There has been no confirmation to reports that Mr. Wallace was a graduate of the Ronald L. Gler school of doubletalk.)

From the budget committee: After some forty-seven fun-filled, action-packed hours of deliberations which spanned five days and several pizzas, the Budget Committee brought forth the tentative budget. Also produced at the meetings were several humorous anecdotes and incidents. Before the committee died, it entered one of its final pre-death rituals; i.e., the "griper-gripee" sessions of October 20 where groups complained about their respective allotments. (No truth to the persistent rumors that all committee members boycotted the meeting.) After the gripe sessions, and any revision by the budget committee, the budget goes to Australian Stevedores and Hedonists for approval or revision. Special praise is in order for the Budget Committee chairman, ASH treasurer Jeffrey Berchenko, for his fairness and unfailing good humor in conducting the meeting. "Hear, hear," "bravo," clap, clap, clap, "way to go Jeffrey," "attaboy Jeff, I knew you wouldn't let the school down."

Now that the budget committee has neared the end, it is time to have awarded the various prizes for committee work. Awarded the Hamilton Burger prosecutor/interrogator award was Dana M. Cole, who like Hamilton never won a case, but certainly was impressive in losing. Winner of the Benny Kubelsky Nice Guy Award was Elaine Wolfe. The Best Imitation of Russian Diplomacy Award was given to John Burton for his now celebrated walkout in a futile attempt to deprive the committee of a quorum and thereby halted the committee's deliberations. The Andrew W. Carnegie Award for generosity went to Marc Shea for his fight on behalf of downtrodden and underpaid groups. Sharing the Best Advocate for Yes on 5 Award were Nan Waldman, John Burton, and Elaine Wolfe, whose smoke pollution exceeded their noise pollution. It would have been no defense that they might have felt that a smoke-filled room was appropriate.

All in all, having served on the budget committee has proven to be a rewarding and amusing experience and one I have enjoyed almost every minute of, including the shoe-banging on the desk as a call for order (shades of Nikita the K.) and the extended and heated debate over whether the committee should appropriate \$11, \$13, or \$15 for a group's postage expenses. (\$15 won by default after the \$13 figure had received the most votes, but the committee decided to round it off.)

Before the resumption of the hearings one Saturday, chairman Berchenko and Hamilton Burger winner Dana Cole were engaged in an argument over the current Middle East situation. (The following is a fairly accurate

representation of the conversation.) In response to Mr. Berchenko, Mr. Cole parried, "Do you know that 18% of the Knesset (the Israeli Parliament) is Arab? Did you know that?" Mr. Berchenko, "Yes, I know that but it only proves my point, etc.," whereupon Mr. Cole replied, "that's nice because I just made up that figure." Score that round for Mr. Cole.

Scandal?: Mr. Berchenko additionally suffered when he was called on the carpet by security for permitting alcohol into the library area (Room 325) for the members' enjoyment. (Your fees helped to buy it.) Hang in there, Jeff, I won't divulge how many bottles you consumed that evening unless guessed. Send your guesses to Happy Times (and drunken Sots?) c/o Allen King locker 1102. A hint: the total number of bottles consumed was less than 350.

Special mention for budget committee work should also go to Kirk (dba/aka "Kent") Khtikian, Rich "The young Turk of the Debate" Nichols, and Sally (no puns on the last name, please) March whose reasoned arguments provided the committee with its more stellar moments.

Scandal?: Benny Kubelsky Award winner Elaine Wolfe shocked the budget committee when, after a long session of deliberation (it was approaching 11:00 pm and the committee was debating whether to adjourn), she proposed a "slumber party." Heh, heh. Several committee members were seen licking their lips in anticipation. Evidently, however, she didn't really mean it. Is she a Republican or what?



Strange Happenings? Or Who was that Masked Man?: Wildly improbable stories regarding this year's section D and events of October 10 have been circulating for about ten days, and the Law News has finally pieced together a major part of the story behind the story. According to initial, erroneous reports, Richard M. Nixon made a surprise visit to the section D Criminal Law class of Professor Wilson on October 10. The former president, reached by telephone at his San Clemente Xanadu, vehemently denied the reports, "(expletive deleted) national security (expletive deleted) Bebe Rebozo (expletive deleted), must have been John Mitchell, inaudible, or what's his (expletive deleted) name Dean. (Expletive deleted) remember I am not a crook." Further investigation by the Law News confirmed Nixon's absence in the Bay Area on the date in question. As the sensational news spread throughout the community, Sam Stuffshirt, noted investigator and man-about town in Antelope, North Dakota came up with more information about the strange events that day. Nixon, he claimed, did not

make a mistake in judgement or utter a misstatement. Ipso fatso, it was in fact an impostor bearing a remarkable resemblance to the ex-president. As Stuffshirt tells it and as gleaned from eyewitness accounts, this is what transpired that day in Room A. A man, perhaps a masked man (not that one, kimosabe, Clayton Moore was not involved) carrying a chocolate cake into class, stood before the class and delivered the following proclamation; a copy of which has been obtained by the Law News. "Hear ye, hear ye, all nattering nabobs of negativism, student bums, and members of the effete corps of impudent snobs, whereas, Spiro T. Agnew was a member of the Bar, and whereas Spiro T. Agnew was the champion of law and order and the scourge of lenient judges, and whereas, Spiro T. Agnew stated, 'I will not resign if indicted,' and whereas Spiro T. Agnew was a crook, and whereas, it was five years ago today that said Agnew pleaded guilty to a felony, to wit, income tax evasion, and resigned from the office of vice-president and was disbarred from the noble profession of the law, Now therefore, I Richard M. Nix-on, do hereby proclaim today Spiro T. Agnew Resignation Day and proclaim festivities throughout the land. By order of the Good Government League, dated this tenth Day of October 1978."

Professor Wilson attempted to physically restrain the impostor (did she know it was an impostor? was she attempting to place him under arrest?). Unsuccessful in her attempt to overpower the man, she resorted to grabbing the proclamation out of the speaker's hands. However, the person, clad in a three piece dark blue suit, continued his oration, as if he had memorized the speech. After concluding, the stranger extended his hand to the professor, and when she reached to shake it, he flashed a double victory (peace) sign and walked out. Professor Wilson did state that the cake, approximately 10" square and cut into twenty pieces, was not large enough for the entire class. Who said law professors don't have a sense of humor?

We are at this moment unable to verify reports that the anniversary cake was liberally laced with marijuana. Any members of section D who witnessed the incident and ate the cake, please drop a note to Spiro T. Agnew Day c/o Allen King.

There are a couple of sidelights to this allegedly humorous incident. A few questions remain. Did Professor Wilson commit a battery on "R.M. Nixon" by attempting to restrain him? Does a professor have the right to touch anyone, especially before class starts? Does a professor have the right to grab a paper from someone's hand? Are professors so uptight that they cannot laugh? No answers are to be found in the book.

It was also reported that Professor Eldredge strongly indicated that he did not think that a similar announcement to his Torts class would be appropriate, especially because it was before a captive audience. Has humor at Hastings, long thought to be terminally ill, finally expired?

Law school underachievement: No entries were received in the contest to name the participants in the "Juicer" incident, so the prize is withdrawn, and the first prize, an all expenses

paid trip to the corner of McAllister and Hyde, has likewise been withdrawn. Sorry late entries will not be accepted.

The cast of Evansleeado: News is that Lee Evans, whose arm injury was not rugby related, is having either his arm or his cast removed on October 20.

Other events: The Alaskan Society of Hermits has seen its workload cut dramatically over the last few weeks. One action taken by the council concerned a proposal by an enterprising student, Bob Kahn, to install a video pong game on the mezzanine overlooking the commons. As the proposal was understood, Mr. Kahn would provide the machine and the maintenance in exchange for one-half of the (mucho) profits. After Mr. Kahn's motion was tabled, a common malady because ASH members don't know what's coming up before the meeting. Unmentioned in the oral presentation was the fact that the manufacturer provides a one year warranty on the game — perhaps obviating the need for any maintenance by Mr. Kahn. President Bill Tappin, fearful that allowing the game to be installed would set a bad precedent, and unhappy over what he regarded as possible inconsistencies in Mr. Kahn's statements, lobbied hard to defeat the proposal. Two weeks after Bob's presentation, the council decisively killed the pong proposal. I have been assured that tales of cash bribes to both sides have been grossly exaggerated.

Trouble brewing about Professors? At a recent ASH meeting, the topic of bad professors surfaced and there was talk about how to get rid of a few, i.e., a student voice in deciding employment policies. (Kidnapping to Morocco was not discussed) It could be a tough issue. More as the story breaks.

Behind the Scenes, behind the times: As some astute observers of this column have realized, there has been no Proposition One to repeal the infamous Appendix One to the ASH Constitution. Reporter's question to Jeff Berchenko, ASH treasurer, regarding the interim appointments: "You mean you want to forget about the Constitution? Mr. Berchenko's answer: "Yes." It appears now that sentiment favors complying "in spirit" with Appendix One and repealing it next spring.

The Power of the Press: After having been viciously tongue-lashed by a disgruntled person mentioned in the last column, permit me this editorial comment on the role of the press. As has been historically noted, the press is a powerful instrument. Look at the success it gave to the UCLA Bruins and the Boston Celtics.

For some fascinating reading, take a few minutes to read the budget, which has been called a masterpiece of literary achievement and "destined to become a best-seller." For autographed copies, drop me a note to Autographs c/o Allen King. Enclose \$5.00 for singing costs.

So dear readers, in the immortal words of Harry Golden, "Enjoy, enjoy." From behind the scenes, until next we meet, I am yours for the ipso fatso.

LETTERS

to the EDITOR



Dear Editor,

I frequently drive to school but was not lucky or perhaps needy enough to receive a space in the Hastings parking lot. As a result, I am forced to battle with other Hastings students for the limited metered spaces surrounding Hastings. Umpiring the continual battle are the watchful eyes and pens of the merciless maidens on their three wheeled triremes. Needless to say, I get my share of tickets as it is often impossible to feed the ravenous parking meters on time.

Unfortunately some one at Hastings still believes in political favoritism and continually parks his/her brown Capri (that's right the one with the mirrored band on the windshield). Sometime last week, after having spent over twenty minutes searching for a space within reasonable walking distance from Hastings, I decided to also park directly in front of the Hyde street lobby. I noticed that the Capri has been parked there for a couple of weeks and never received a ticket. (During that same period, I received two tickets — one for \$5 for failing to reach my ailing meter prior to the proscribed time, and a \$10 ticket for having failed to move my car before 4:00 p.m.) Meanwhile, the Capri has always parked in the white three

minute passenger loading zone directly in front of the Hyde street entrance. I reckoned that the owner had a healthy disrespect for parking ordinances (San Francisco will do that to you) and reasoned that the meter persons were being lax in ticketing vehicles illegally parked in this area. Imagine my horror when I emerged from Hastings, only to find an annoying white slip of paper under my windshield washer blade, effectively draining my pocket book of another \$10. At first I supposed it was simply my unlucky day and that the meter people had decided to enforce the law in the white and yellow curbed "free zone." When I gazed up the street at the other offender (the brown Capri) however, I was amazed to see no ticket. Upon closer examination I discovered that the Capri had a white business card on the dashboard which bore California's official seal and the name of a Los Angeles Superior Court Judge! Apparently political favoritism has a great deal of clout among San Francisco's parking meter persons. I wonder if this type of activity violates the Rules of Professional Conduct or Code of Judicial Conduct. While improperly parking in the yellow and white area creates a nuisance to those who seek to legitimately utilize this

space, the fact that a student makes use of the officed, influence and prestige of a Superior Court judge to receive special treatment from public law enforcement officials is outrageous. Whether or not the Judge is aware of the situation the appearance that the Judge condones such a activity damages the integrity of the legal profession. I am reminded of the quote:

Integrity is the very breath of justice. Confidence in our law, our courts, and in the administration of justice is our supreme interest. No practice must be permitted to prevail which invites towards the administration of justice a doubt or distrust of its integrity.

If this letter sounds like sour grapes — it is. However, when I act improperly I accept the consequences and refrain from using the prestige of others to openly flout the law.

Dear Letter-writer,

Reliable sources claim that the brown Capri belongs to Jerry Gale, unsuccessful candidate for last year's ASH presidential race.

Jerrard Goldin, third year student told me that the judge's card in question

belonged to his uncle, and that the assumption that you suggest in the letter is the reason why Jerry displays the card on the dashboard.

I spoke with the Presiding Judge's secretary who told me that Jerry's uncle is now retired and lives in Encino. The judge could not be reached by phone.

We checked the ethics code and spoke to the State Bar. There are different violations possible, but it is not clear whether they apply to law students.

Editor

Your letter came in at the last moment, we can not give you an adequate answer as this issue goes to press.

Meanwhile, I have noticed that the Capri does not park there any more.

HASTINGS STUDENT COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE JFK, MLK ASSASSINATIONS

A new student committee has been formed to provide up-to-date information on the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King to the Hastings College of the Law student body, and to petition public officials for appropriate action. The current failure of the House Select Committee on Assassinations to confront the crucial evidence and issues surrounding these two tragedies has supplied the impetus for formation of this new Hastings student group.

Over the years since the assassinations, individuals trying to reopen the investigations into the murders focused their efforts on Congress because of possible involvement in the assassinations and coverups by federal intelligence agencies. In 1975, their work appeared to finally bear fruit as the House of Representatives voted an appropriation for a select committee to reinvestigate the Kennedy and King murders. Richard Sprague, a proven prosecutor of politically powerful figures, was hired to head the Select Committee staff. However, after stating that he would subpoena all relevant FBI and CIA records, and thoroughly investigate all possible leads, dissension developed between him and certain Select Committee members. These problems were compounded by the inflammatory reporting of the establishment media which has never been sympathetic to the view that the official versions of these assassinations are a cruel hoax upon the American people. The defenders of the official versions got their way; Richard Sprague was removed from the committee staff.

Cornell Law School Professor Wil-

liam Blakey replaced Sprague as chief counsel to the Select Committee even though he had a conflict of interest in that he was a member of the U.S. Department of Justice from 1960 to 1964. At his first and only press conference, "The Professor," as Blakey likes to be called, announced that the Select Committee staff would no longer attempt to "solve" the murders, but would instead confine itself to an investigation of the original Federal investigatory agencies, i.e., the FBI and CIA.

The Select Committee public hearings have revealed that even this modest goal is beyond the professor's political parameters. For example, a high FBI official give embarrassing testimony concerning the disciplinary actions taken against various special agents after the Kennedy assassination, whoever, Blakey did not call FBI Special Agent James Hosty to testify.

Hosty, currently a special agent in Kansas City, has long been a significant figure to JFK assassination investigators. Stationed in Dallas in 1963, Hosty twice visited Ruth Paine, the woman with whom Marina Oswald and her child lived. After Hosty's second visit, Lee Harvey Oswald went to the Dallas FBI office and left him a note. This note was destroyed shortly after the assassination, possibly on orders from J. Edgar Hoover. In addition, the FBI attempted to conceal from the Warren Commission the fact that Hosty's name, telephone number, and automobile license plate number were in Oswald's address book after he was arrested for the murder of Dallas Police Officer J.D. Tippett; finally, Hosty was one of the

first federal officials to see Oswald in the custody of the Dallas Police.

Agent Hosty, according to a story carried on national wire services and printed in the San Francisco Chronicle during the public hearings last month, told reporters that he had given information to not only the House Select Committee but also the Warren Commission and the Church Committee on Intelligence Agencies that would blow the Kennedy assassination case wide open. Furthermore, Hosty said that he would welcome the chance to publicly testify. Professor Blakey, however, explicitly stated during the public hearings, which featured such self serving witnesses as Richard Helms and Gerald Ford, that he would not call Special Agent Hosty before the American people.

Critics of the Warren Commission have insisted that the physical evidence is inconsistent with the conclusion that Kennedy was killed by a "lone nut" assassin. Particularly, the Commission's findings on the so-called single bullet theory, the direction of the fatal shot to the President's head, and the authenticity of the infamous backyard photographs of Oswald have been attacked as totally unsupportable on the basis of the evidence. Instead of abandoning the Warren Commission's tenuous position, the House Select Committee under Blakey produced phalanxes of police experts, reams of statistics, and incomprehensible theories in defense of the "lone nut" conclusion. This conclusion cannot stand, however, if any one of the above findings of the Warren Commission is wrong.

The single bullet theory is that a

single bullet from Oswald's rifle entered the President's back, exited from his throat, struck Texas Governor Connally in the back, exited below his right nipple breaking a rib, smashed through the large radius bone in Connally's wrist and penetrated his thigh. This bullet was found on a stretcher in Dallas' Parkland Hospital in nearly pristine condition. Problems with the theory are: President Kennedy's back and throat wounds do not line up properly and these in turn do not line up with Governor Connally's

wounds, the two men appear to be hit more than a second and a half apart in a film of the assassination taken by amateur photographer Abraham Zapruder, and the bullet that inflicted seven wounds and broke two bones emerged practically unscathed. The Select Committee's panels of experts attempted to demonstrate that the trajectories did in fact line up, and that fragments taken from Connally's wrist came from the bullet found on the stretcher. The Select Committee

Please Turn to Page 9

1979 CLIENT COUNSELLING
COMPETITION

The Law Student Division of the American Bar Association will again sponsor the Client Counseling Competition. The regional competitions will take place on March 10, 1979 (locations to be announced). The national competition will be held March 31 and April 1, 1979 at the University of San Diego School of Law in San Diego, California.

"Legal Malpractice: Yes, No, or Maybe" will be the subject of the competition this year. Each American Bar Association approved law school is invited to enter one team composed of two law students in the competition. In order to enter, a school must have its dean's approval and a professor must agree to advise the team. The entry form (attached) and a fifty dollar (\$50.00) entry fee must be sent to the Law Student Division by November 30, 1978. Any entry postmarked after November 30, 1978, will be returned to the sender.

If you think that your school might be interested in serving as one of the regional host schools, please consult your dean as well as your team's faculty advisor and indicate this interest on your application form. The major responsibilities of a host school are: holding the competition at your school on March 10, 1979, obtaining judges for the competition, and obtaining persons to act as the clients. The Law Student Division will provide detailed information concerning the organization of the regional competition to those schools chosen as host schools. The Division will reimburse the host school for a lunch for the participants on the day of the competition and for other minor costs.

Clamato?

Feel creative?

Well, you can earn \$1,000 for a good imaginative idea according to Raymond M. Anrig, President of the Duffy-Mott Company. Mr. Anrig will pay that much (plus second and third prize awards of \$500 and \$250) to the college student who comes up with the winning answer to...What is a Clamato?

Where is it found? Does it grow? Who invented it? Do you eat it, drink it, pickle it? Where do you buy it? In a hardware store, a supermarket, an apothecary shop? Is it sexy?

This unusual research challenge has been hurled at America's college population—to find the most intriguing and humorous definition of a Clamato, whatever it is.

A panel of famous judges will select the winners, according to Mr. Anrig, who said the competition will be extended until December 15, 1978.

The contest is open to any current full-time college student in the United States.

The answer to "What is a Clamato?" can be submitted in the form of an article, short story, fable, a painting, cartoon, jungle, photograph, sculpture, or any other means a student may employ. Contestants may enter as many times as they wish and no proof of purchase is necessary.

All entries should be sent to:

What is a Clamato Contest
17th Floor

1212 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Entries and ideas cannot be returned and will become the property of the Duffy-Mott Company. Decisions of the judges will be final. Be sure to provide your name and address as well as the name of your college or university with your entry.

Congress Ends Paraquat Funding

In a major victory in the continuing drive to stop the use of dangerous herbicides on marijuana fields in Mexico, the House and Senate gave final approval to Congressional language effectively banning further use of U.S. funds after October 1, 1978. The measure was signed into law by President Carter on September 27. The provisions concerning herbicides were included in an amendment to the Security Assistance Act in the House/Senate Conference Committee after each chamber passed a different version originally.

Senator Charles Percy (R-Ill.) and his committee staff deserve tremendous credit for developing support within the Senate for original approval of this amendment, and subsequently for winning Conference Committee approval over the objections of Rep.

Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.). Reps. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) and George Miller (D-Calif.) led the anti-paraquat forces in the House and also deserve our sincere appreciation and support.

Language was added in the Conference Committee indicating that the ban would no longer apply if methods could be devised to adequately warn the consumer that the sprayed marijuana was contaminated. The State Department's consultants have concluded that their efforts to color the contaminated marijuana by adding a red dye to the paraquat have not been successful. Until a method can be devised whereby aerial spraying of herbicides will result in a coloring process which "will clearly and readily" warn potential users, further use of U.S. funding for this program is no longer legally permissible.



FREE

CATALOG of COLLEGIATE RESEARCH

Over 10,000 listings! All subjects.

Send NOW for this FREE catalog.

(offer expires Dec. 31, 1978)

Send to: COLLEGIATE RESEARCH
P.O. Box 84396, Los Angeles, CA. 90073

Hastings Drops in Nationwide
Student Enrollment Ranking

I. Total Enrollment (1977)

1. Georgetown University Law Center	2,593
2. New York University	2,574
3. Harvard Law School	1,821
4. Southwestern University	1,722
5. Suffolk University	1,721
6. George Washington University	1,658
7. John Marshall Law School	1,614
8. University of Texas	1,578
9. Hastings College of Law	1,501
10. Temple University	1,370

II. Full-time Enrollment (1977)

1. Harvard Law School	1,821
2. Georgetown University Law Center	1,593
3. University of Texas	1,578
4. Hastings College of Law	1,501
5. New York University	1,399
6. Boston University	1,164
7. University of Michigan	1,151
8. University of Miami	1,145
9. William Mitchell College of Law	1,114
10. University of Virginia	1,089

Statistics are from *A Review of Legal Education in the United States*—Fall 1977 published by ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar (1978).

The Academia Waltz



by Berke Breathed



A Comment

Centennial Snooze

By Dana Cole



Proclaiming that no one present would live to see a second, Hastings College of the Law celebrated its 100th anniversary last weekend in a dinner-dance held at the St. Francis Hotel.

The \$125-a-plate centennial attracted about 600 optionally black-tied guests; including dignitaries, alumni, socialites, administrators, professors and students. Proceeds from the gala will help finance construction costs for the new law center complex.

The evening conspicuously lacked all but a few references to Hastings and its past 100 years. Instead, the two keynote speakers, Ambassador Elliot Richardson and Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) gave what many considered to be dull, esoteric speeches.

Richardson, the U.S. Ambassador to the Law and the Sea Conference, privately confessed not knowing why he was invited to speak, having no connection with Hastings. (Richardson, who has held several cabinet positions, perhaps is best known for his role in "The Saturday Night Massacre," when he refused to fire Special Watergate Prosecutor Archibald Cox.)

During his speech, Richardson appeared somewhat intoxicated, slurring his words while speaking to the slightly embarrassed audience. Earlier in the evening, he was observed trying to "pick up" on Hastings 3rd year student Patty Kaitz. Kaitz smiled and presumably thought about what could have been.

In his speech, Richardson said that lawyers are not always appreciated, but nevertheless are "regarded as a necessary evil," by the American public.

He said the United States is the most litigious society in the world, and quoted Harvard law professor Grant Gilmore, saying, "The better the society the less law there will be. In heaven there will be no laws. In hell, nothing but law and due process will be meticulously observed."

He added, "The U.S. is rapidly on the road to hell."

Richardson then briefly spoke about The Law and the Sea Conference. He stressed the need for "the resolution of disputes and the avoidance of conflict" among the super-power nations.

"The days of gunboat diplomacy are gone. Instead we should concentrate on resolving disputes between the super-powers through the traditional processes of adjudication," he said.

"Therefore," he concluded, "lawyers are going to be needed more than ever on a broader scale."

Richardson cut his speech short, stating, he had to go to "Haavard" (sic) and dedicate a new Kennedy school on public policy.

After Richardson's speech, Justice A. Frank Bray, a Hastings Board member, provided the comic relief of the evening. He presented two Hastings Life Achievement awards to former University of California President Charles Hitch and former California Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Traynor, now a Hastings distinguished professor.

When introduced, Bray walked over to the microphone located on the orchestra platform, rather than to the podium at the head table. Master of Ceremonies Casper Weinberger suggested Bray present the awards at the head table. Hastings Professor Moffitt Hancock then assisted Bray over to the proper location.

Once there, Bray introduced President Hitch by reciting his scholastic degrees. After stating some of the more commonly known degrees, Bray said, "He also holds a B.O., whatever that is, a B.M., an M.G. and an L.S.D."

U.S. Senator "Pat" Moynihan then rose to make his speech. Instead of preparing remarks for the occasion, he said he would read from a paper he wrote on the role of social science in judicial decision-making. A discernible "Ugh" came from the audience.

Sensing their mood, Moynihan asked for a show of hands from those in the audience who preferred to be sent that portion of the Congressional Record which contained the article. Politely, nobody raised their hand.

The Senator then proceeded to read his paper.

About this time, Hastings Associate Dean James Crawford scribbled a note on a sugar packet and passed it on to student Ben Davidian. The note said, "Fifty-five minutes to Saturday Night Live," referring to a popular television program.

Back at the podium, Moynihan talked about how courts have increasingly come to rely upon "knowable but not known" social science theories in deciding difficult legal issues.

He cited the Warren court's reliance upon such data in deciding *Brown v. Board of Education* and the use of public opinion polls in death penalty cases.

Moynihan then told his audience that he would "skip from page 14 (of the article) to page 29," provoking the evening's loudest applause.

He concluded by complimenting Chief Justice Burger for his recently decided *Snail Darter* opinion, in which the court blocked the billion dollar construction of a TVA dam after construing the endangered species laws.

Moynihan said the Chief Justice relied solely upon the law in deciding the case, rather than becoming entangled in politics and social science.

Almost immediately after Moynihan's speech the party broke up, with most of the guests rushing out of the Grand Ballroom.

However, about 50 people remained to dance to the music of Dick Crest and his band. Perhaps, the lingerers felt that the University of California's oldest law school deserved more on its 100th birthday.

Appropriately, Hastings Dean Marvin Anderson was the last to leave the dance floor before calling it a night.

★★★★★★★★★★

This the second in a series for the Banquet Editor. Complimentary tickets will be accepted by Mr. Cole for a not necessarily objective but fair coverage of any major banquet.



COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS EXTENDED TO HASTING'S EMPLOYEES

by Professor Joseph R. Grodin

State and local government employees, like agricultural workers, are excluded from coverage under the National Labor Relations Act and are, therefore, subject to state law. Most large states now have laws which govern labor relations for public employees through a state agency modeled after the National Labor Relations Board. California, however, has been singularly backward in that development. Until 1975 it had only patchwork of separate statutes covering transit employees, local government employees, school district employees, and state employees. In 1975 California moved toward the federal model as regards school district employees, establishing an Education Employment Relations Board with jurisdiction to determine bargaining units, conduct elections, and police unfair labor practices. Last year the name of the agency was changed to Public Employee Relations Board and its jurisdiction expanded to include most state employees. Employees in institutions of higher learning were, however, excluded from coverage.

Now the legislature has enacted, and the governor has signed, a bill extending collective bargaining rights to employees of the University of California, the California State University and Colleges system, and Hastings College of the Law, all subject to the jurisdiction of PERB. The new law becomes effective July 1, 1979. Its principal features, as they apply to Hastings, are as follows:

1. The statute covers all employees of Hastings except confidential and managerial employees. The statute provides with respect to managerial employees that:

"No employee or group of employees shall be deemed managerial employees solely because the employee or group of employees participate in decisions with respect to courses, curriculum, personnel and other matters of educational policy."

Thus, the statute appears to reject the reasoning of a recent Second Circuit opinion to the effect that faculty may be deemed managerial employees under the NLRA because of such participation. The statute also provides that the board may find student employees whose employment is contingent on their status as students to be "employees" within the meaning of the Act "only if the services they provide are unrelated to their educational

objectives, or, that those educational objectives are subordinate to the services they perform and that coverage under the chapter would further the purposes of this chapter."

2. Section 3565 provides that employees have the "right to form, join and participate in the activities of employee organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation on all matters of employer-employee relations and for the purpose of meeting and conferring" as well as the right "to refuse to join employee organizations or to participate in the activities of these organizations subject to the organizational security provision permissible under this chapter." Section 3583 allows organizational security arrangements in the form of an agency shop, i.e. a requirement for payment of the standard initiation fee, periodic dues, and general assessments of an employee organization, and for the periodic check-off of such amounts from wages. In these respects the statute is similar to the NLRA except that the phrase "concerted activities" is notably absent.

3. The statute grants certain additional rights, including the right of access to bulletin boards, mailboxes and other means of communication, the right to use institutional facilities as reasonable times for meetings, and the right of organizational representatives to released/reassigned time for attendance at meetings and the processing of grievances.

4. Section 3571 makes it an unfair labor practice for a higher education employer to impose or threaten to impose reprisals on employees, to discriminate or threaten to discriminate against employees, or otherwise to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees because of their exercise of rights guaranteed by the statute. It is also an unfair labor practice for an employer to "dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any employee organization, or contribute financial or other support to it, or in any way encourage employees to join any organization in preference to another." (Quaere: will that language stand the test of the First Amendment?) It is similarly an unfair labor practice for an employee organization to impose or threaten to impose reprisals on employees, to discriminate against employees, or otherwise to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees because of their exercise of rights under the statute.

5. An employee organization can obtain exclusive recognition rights under the statute by submitting a demand for recognition coupled with proof of majority support submitted to the board or an impartial third party. An employer is required (with certain exceptions) to grant such a request unless it "reasonably doubts" that the employee organization has majority support or appropriateness of the requested unit, or is confronted with a conflicting claim for representation by another organization. In that event (or in the event an employee organization decides to proceed directly through petition to the board) the board determines the appropriate bargaining unit and conducts an election therein. In determining the appropriateness of a bargaining unit the board is required to consider a number of factors, including a presumption that professional employees and nonprofessional employees shall not be in the same unit. In the case of the University of California generally, the Act provides that the only appropriate units for members of the academic senate shall be either statewide or divisional, but there is no comparable unit specification for Hastings. Supervisory employees are excluded from participating in certain activities of employee organizations on behalf of non-supervisory employees, but otherwise (and contrary to the NLRA) have organizational and bargaining rights.

6. Exclusive recognition carries with it the right to engage in "meeting and conferring" on "all matters within the scope of representation." In the case of the University of California generally, and in the case of the California State University and Colleges, the statute provides both a definition of "scope of representation" and an outline of procedure for "meeting and conferring." "Scope of representation" is defined in both cases, following the federal model, to mean "wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment", with certain exceptions, the nature of which varies somewhat between the two entities. "meeting and conferring" is defined, in both cases, to include liaison with the Department of Finance and the Legislature. In the case of Hastings, however, neither term is defined. Any question as to either, therefore, would presumably be a question for PERB. Outside the scope of representation, an exclusive representative has the

right to "consult and be consulted." Failure to meet and confer on the part of either employer or employee organization is an unfair labor practice subject to PERB jurisdiction.

7. The statute permits agreement to arbitrate disputes which may arise under a written memorandum of understanding.

8. In the event of impasse in negotiations over matters within the scope of representation either party may request the board to appoint a mediator, whose expenses will be paid by the board. If the mediator is unsuccessful in effecting settlement within 15 days and considers factfinding to be appropriate, either party may request that differences be submitted to a factfinding panel, whose chairperson is appointed by the board. If the dispute is not resolved within 30 days after appointment of the panel (or a longer period if agreed upon by the parties) then the panel issues findings of fact and recommended terms of settlement. The findings and recommendations are first submitted to the parties privately, and (if there is no settlement) made public after 10 days. The recommendations are advisory only, and do not result in a binding award.

9. The statute contains certain "sunshine" provisions designed to provide public awareness of bargaining positions and afford opportunity for public comment. Thus, all initial proposals from both side are to be made public, and meeting and conferring does not commence until the public has had opportunity to express itself regarding the proposal at a meeting of the governing board. New subjects arising after presentation of initial proposals are also to be made public within 24 hours. The process of meeting and conferring, as well as meetings with mediators and factfinders and executive sessions of the governing board when discussing meeting and conferring strategy, are excluded from the open meeting requirements of the Brown Act, except that in the case of negotiations with employee organizations representing student service or academic personnel a "student representative" designated by the student association is to be notified of the issues under discussion and has the right to be present and comment "at reasonable times during meeting and conferring" and to comment to the mediator on impasse issues. The student representative is to be "free from coercion and reprisals" but is expected to "maintain the rules governing confidentiality as they pertain to all parties involved in the meeting and conferring."

YOU AND PROPOSITION U

Continued From Page 3

purpose of forcing tenants to move out. More and more people would be coming to me with lawsuits charging landlords of discrimination (landlords would be in the position of renting to the most attractive tenants rather than the ones willing to pay the price), or of taking bribes (if high rents are illegal, another way to get the apartment is by offering some extra-legal payment). Attorneys should fare quite well under rent control.

In conclusion, I am opposed to rent controls and to Proposition U because by controlling rents we will remove the primary incentive for constructing new housing when demand is high. With or without rent rebate laws, rents will in time reflect lower property taxes as landlords compete for tenants. In the meantime, rent controls, while not harmful in the short run, are likely to become long run phenomena with all the problems of poor maintenance and insufficient new housing units available to renters. But even under Proposition U, it

will be almost impossible to determine what is a "fair" return on a given improvement. What is a "reasonably expected life" for new plumbing? For a new garage door opener? For a full time guard? New carpets? Paint? Why should we legislate rules for decisions that have been made so successfully in the marketplace?

Whatever your answers to these questions, I suggest that you start looking now for that dream apartment. Sure, you can't afford it now, but I expect Proposition U to pass, and I expect it to be followed by additional

rent control measures. The apartment you cannot afford today is in fact a bargain. If you act quickly. Only by finding it now, renting it, and staying there will you be able to profit by Proposition U. In several years, when your friends are paying three times what you are paying, you can relax, knowing that no one can raise your rent. (Oops, there goes that bad pipe in the kitchen again. But it's so hard to get hold of the landlord these days . . .)

The author is an economist at SRI International, Menlo Park.

Continued From Page 5

never attempted to account for the fact that the Zapruder film shows the President reacting to his wound one and a half seconds before the Governor shows signs of being hit.

The one and a half second interval between the reactions of the two men is crucial because in test firings conducted for the Warren Commission the FBI determined that Oswald's bolt action rifle could not be fired twice in less than 2.3 seconds. Therefore, since the Zapruder film shows Connally was hit not more than 1.7 seconds after Kennedy, for Oswald to have been the lone assassin Connally would have had to have been hit by the same bullet that struck the President. However, the timing between the first two shots was proved conclusively by new evidence presented to the Select Committee. An audio tape of the assassination, made when a Dallas motorcycle officer inadvertently left his radio on during the shooting, reveals that the first two shots first at Kennedy were 1.6 seconds apart. This tape was nicknamed by the Select Committee staffers "Blakey's problem."

After the first shot(s) that hit Kennedy and Connally, the Zapruder film vividly shows the President being struck in the head and driven back by the fatal bullet. Critics contend that the violent backward motion of the President's head is consistent with a shot from the grassy knoll area to the right and front of the President and inconsistent with a shot from the rear, Oswald's alleged position.

Three of the doctors working to save the President's life at Parkland Hospital stated later that day that the fatal bullet struck him in the front leaving a gaping exit wound in the back of his head. At the president's autopsy, however, the entry wound was described as being from the rear but at the hairline, too low to be responsible

for the gaping wound described by the Parkland doctors. The Select Committee produced X-rays and drawings based on autopsy photographs of the President's head. These clearly show an entrance wound in Kennedy's head, but at the cowlick, five inches higher than the original autopsy drawings. Each successive version of the wound becomes more consistent with a shot from Oswald's alleged position. The Law Student Assassination Information Committee intends to purchase a copy of the Zapruder film so the Hastings community can decide for itself which version of the wound is plausible.

In early 1964, America was presented with a picture of Lee Harvey Oswald on the cover of Life Magazine with the pistol that allegedly killed Officer Tippett, the rifle that allegedly killed Kennedy and copies of the Communist Party newspaper "The Worker" and the Socialist Worker Party's "The Militant." Obviously, if this photo and two similar ones are authentic, Oswald indeed looks guilty as a leftist "lone nut" assassin. However, photo analysts, both ama-

teur and expert in this country and abroad, have concluded that these are composite photos basing their findings on several substantial anomalies. Lecturing critics use slide presentations to demonstrate these anomalies. The Select Committee's panel of experts, however, failed to address itself to these problems, purporting to authenticate the photos by collateral facts. It is useless to discuss the qualities of these photos further without having them reproduced here; therefore, one of the principal projects of the new Law Students Assassination Information Committee is to present slide shows and lectures, free of charge, to the Hastings community.

The second purpose of the House Select Committee on Assassinations is to investigate the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Unlike the Kennedy case, there is very little physical evidence of the circumstances surrounding this murder. King was shot in the neck by a single bullet fired from somewhere across the street while he was standing on a motel balcony. Furthermore, the case against James Earl Ray is purely circumstantial, and there may be significant exculpatory evidence. What makes the King case so ominous is that leading up to the mysterious death of Dr. King is a long history of official FBI harassment, virtually a personal vendetta by Director J. Edgar Hoover. Many of the questions surrounding the case could be settled in the adversary context of a trial on the merits for James Earl Ray.

Ray never had a trial because he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 99 years in the Tennessee Penitentiary. Ray contends that his guilty plea was coerced and that he was betrayed by his lawyer, Percy Foreman, who had a \$165,000 personal stake in the outcome of the case. Percy Foreman's representation of Ray was a disgrace to the legal

profession. After Ray was arrested for the King murder, he was informed by his legal counsel that he would have to tell his story of the assassination to finance his legal defense. After submitting a 20,000 words to southern author William Bradford Huie, Ray fired his counsel and retained Percy Foreman. For several months Foreman falsely told Ray that he was investigating and preparing for a "not guilty" plea. During this period of his confinement Ray was kept in a constantly lit room with a guard. Right before he was scheduled to go to trial, Foreman had him sign away \$165,000 in royalties for counsel fees. If Ray went to trial, the information provided by Huie would no longer have been exclusive, and the value of Ray's literary contract would have diminished considerably. The following day Foreman somehow convinced Ray to plead guilty and accept his 99 year sentence.

Except for his plea of guilty, Ray has always maintained that he did not shoot Martin Luther King. The day after he entered that plea, Ray began moving for a new trial. The trial judge

died of an apparent stroke while reading Ray's petition. Under Tennessee Code Annotated, section 17-117, a motion for a new trial pending before a judge who becomes permanently incapacitated must be granted. Nevertheless, Ray's motion was denied!

The House Select Committee has dealt with James Earl Ray nearly as cavalierly as the Tennessee courts. Before Ray testified, an unidentified committee member stated that the committee would crucify him, and crucify him they did using tactics that make one appreciate the rules of evidence. Investigators of King's assassination maintain that there is substantial evidence on which Ray could be acquitted. The Law Students Assassination Information Committee will attempt to bring major figures in

the case, such as Ray's attorney, Mark Lane, to speak at Hastings. Hopefully, Hastings students will help pressure state and federal judicial authorities to grant Ray a new trial.

As outlined above, the new Law Students Assassination Information Committee intends to undertake projects as purchase and showing of the Zapruder film, to present slide shows and lectures on the JFK assassination to make arrangements for major speakers in the King case, and to petition government officials for appropriate action. Anyone interested in contacting the committee should leave a note for John Burton in locker 1324 or Walter Crockett in locker 578 or call 824-3787 evenings.

By John Burton
Walter Crockett

Hastings Student Jailed

Deborah Kaufman, a third year classmate, was among seven members of the Anti-Martial Law Coalition (AMLC) a nationally based group, sentenced on October 17 to 45 days in the county jail for their peaceful protest of violations of democratic and human rights in the Philippines.

Six months ago, these seven members of the AMLC, including Reverend Lloyd Wake, minister at Glide Memorial Church, Dr. Walden Bello, professor at San Francisco City College and Goddard College, Sylvia Kimura of American Friends Service Committee, and Deborah, also a member of the National Board of Directors of Amnesty International, visited the Philippine Consulate in San Francisco with the intent of delivering a message to "President" Marcos, demanding the lifting of martial law and the release of 1500 people who had been arrested after the recently staged sham "elections" of April 7, 1978. The seven were arrested in the Consulate and four charges, including trespass and resisting arrest were lodged against them.

Since the imposition of martial law in 1972, Marcos has called for five referenda-plebiscites and one election, all of which have been exposed internationally as fraudulent. Marcos' attempt to appear as a one-man ruler with popular support, however, cannot disguise his continued repressive action and denial of human rights and liberties in the Philippines. Amnesty International has documented the fact that there are thousands of political prisoners scattered throughout Philippine prison camps. Hundreds of deaths and disappearances continue to occur in an attempt by Marcos to dispose of any opposition to his martial law regime.

The trial of the seven commenced on September 18, 1978, the week of the sixth anniversary of the establishment of martial law in the Philippines, and continued for eight days, including two days of jury deliberation. The seven were acquitted on three of the four charges, including resisting arrest and general intent to trespass. However, in an apparent jury compromise, the defendants were found guilty of violating Penal Code § 602 (J), trespass with the specific intent to disrupt the business of the consulate, notwithstanding Judge Richard P. Figone's admission during the sentence hearing that the seven were perhaps no more than "rude" to a woman at the Consulate while obtain-

ing her visa.

During this sentencing proceeding, one defense attorney requested that the court consider a token sentence to recognize the courage and conviction of the seven in their duty and right to speak out against the heinous crimes of Marcos. The District Attorney, represented by Danny Alberti, proposed 120 hours of jail clean up as an answer to the defendants' exercise of their strong moral and ethical convictions with regard to human rights violations. The court rejected outright this ridiculous and humiliating proposal. However, Judge Richard P. Figone pronounced an equally harsh sentence of forty-five days in the county jail, suspended sentence and one year probation with a condition of 120 hours of community service with a city based organization. In imposing this sentence could the judge have been unaware of the defendants' moral stance which necessitated a rejection of any punishment? The defendants were left with no choice but to be incarcerated for 45 days in the county jail.

It was not surprising that the seven chose not to accept this sentence for it was perceived as a fetter on their freedom to openly dissent against those regimes which continuously deny basic civil liberties. In weighing freedom of speech versus the private property right of the Philippine Consulate, one cannot help but look at the critical issue, "To what extent will San Francisco courts protect President Marcos by allowing his influence in the United States to curtail free speech?" Should the First Amendment of the United States Constitution be held second to the protection of private property of a foreign country which continuously deprives its people of fundamental rights to life and liberty?

The U.S. government's maintenance of military bases in the Philippines along with the D.A.'s full cooperation with the Marcos employees indicate a strong interest in protecting the Marcos regime. Further, the harsh sentence imposed by the judge will only discourage any effective peaceful dissent of any repressive government in the Bay Area. At the present time suspension of the sentence should be requested of Judge Richard P. Figone to ameliorate this situation.

Authors' names have been withheld by request.

MUSIC IN YOUR EARS

By JULES KRAGAN

STEVE MARTIN—A WILD AND CRAZY GUY

O.K. We have seen him host Saturday Night Live plenty of times. He also blew most of the country away a few weeks ago along with Burt Reynolds when working the Tonight Show. But can a man who is pictured on the cover of his record in a white suit and bunny ears capture our collective comedy minds? Seems so. For anyone who wondered whether Steve Martin had enough hot material to survive the initial popularity burst it is not even a question. America's comedy darling is home free. The second side was recorded just up from the Tenderloin on Bush Street at the Boarding House. The intimate Martin is in fine form, talking on intellectuals, college, religion, French, art, etc. Most of the set is a series of one liners and short skits held together by loose themes such as language. He plays with the audience, working them, degrading and often threatening ("I don't need you...I can do this act alone...I often do..."), destroying any sense of reality that may have existed in the listener's mind. He suggests a dirty trick for parents to pull on a three year old who is learning to talk, "whenever your kid is around...talk

wrong." He plays the absurd better than any other comedian by taking our day to day experiences and pushing them one step beyond.

Side two is another world, enter the wild and crazy guy. Recorded in a 3,000 seat hall in Colorado, the audience was borderline beserk, red-light crazies going wacko over Martin's very presence, screaming so hard they ignored much of the comedy. It was reaching for the lowest common denominator, but to jump on him for being commercial is to do the obvious. This country is dying to have happy feet. Let them have it. Besides, the side one is enough of a joy one need not worry about his comedy career. The introduction to the Colorado set at the beginning of side two could be one of the funniest lead ups a show has ever had. Still, rather than try to interpret what he means, you should just listen and laugh. Who else could have given us kitty handcuffs for raging cat embezzlers? Just be careful in the grocery store, or else a bit of his absurdity may creep into your daily life, and you may find yourself talking to the checker with an arrow through your head.



Al Jarreau—All Fly Home

On his fourth album, Al Jarreau puts it all together as a singer and songwriter. It is not that he has not done so before, but the confidence and security of a successful musical career adds a sense of maturity to his music which was lacking. Here, he offers his usual blend of r and b with a lot of gospel and jazz influence, and it works.

Jarreau uses his performing band on this date, showing that they can play in the studio with ease. The band is augmented by jazz stars Lee Rittenour on guitar, Paulino DeCosta on percussion, and Freddie Hubbard on flugelhorn, while Jarreau sings a 1970's version of r and b. Mercifully the disco influence is slight as evidenced by the increasing use of synthesizers and more pronounced beat. However jazz remains a major influence upon his work, a samba/bossa nova rhythm appears on some tracks and the musicianship is superb. In any characterization of his music, one fact stands out, the music is romantic and alive.

Of five original songs on the album, three are co-authored with long time keyboards player Tom Canning. These represent the strongest songs on the album. Many are, once again, based on love and romance and are always on the upswing. The first tune, "Thinking About It Too" sets the pace of the record. It is an uptempo, teasing composition about the excitement of rekindling an old romance. It is followed by a beautiful ballad, "I'm Home."

The only lackluster songs on this album are fairly uninspiring remakes of a few classics, "Sitting on The Dock of the Bay," and the Beatles' "She's Leaving Home." At this point, if Jarreau has more songs reflecting his writing talents, there would be no need to do covers such as this anymore.

In any case, dumping producer Tommy LiPuma (who does George Benson amongst others) proved to be a great move. The lack of strings and open presence of the record has given Jarreau's voice the chance to shine. Now he knits notes with authority, evidencing his incredible vocal range. After this record, it is only a question of a hit single between Al Jarreau and superstardom.

Weather Report—Mr. Gone

After a year and a half absence, another Weather Report album is upon us. It is predictable that Zawinul remains a genius, working a variety of keyboards (including a Rhodes 88, ARP 2600, Oberheim Polyphonic, and Prophet 5) creating a variety of sounds and textures which is unparalleled. Pastorius continues to emerge as possibly the second strongest voice in the group, especially in songwriting. Shorter seems to be falling away for one reason or another, his playing is limited, and his compositions somewhat uninspired. The group adds a lot of vocals on this album, which sometimes gets in the way of the music, and the concept of Maurice White (of Earth, Wind and Fire) and Denice Williams on a Weather Report album is a bit far fetched. With all of that, it is still leagues above most jazz albums released this year.

Devo—Q: Are We Not Men? A. We Are Devo.

This collection of mindless songs played by amateur musicians in funny costumes yielding an album which some characterize as cute, others more accurately characterize it as pitiful. Not even Brian Eno's usually brilliant production and great cover can save this effort. Not a chance.

Ask Mac

Dear MAC: I am a first year student and I find that there are certain people in my section who always volunteer to speak in class, but never say anything intelligent. This gets me so angry that I lose the ability to concentrate, even when something important is being communicated. What should I do?

—FUMING IN THE FIRST ROW

Dear FUMING: The feelings you describe are not uncommon to law students and others who daily contend with the self-serving remarks of an auditory Narcissus. In order to release anger and regain concentration, you and similarly afflicted classmates, should organize a game of Jackass Bingo.

First, enlist a group of classmates as players and identify all the jackasses in your section. Then make up and distribute traditional Bingo cards which substitute the names of the jackasses for the numbers. When a jackass speaks in class, cover their name if it appears on your card. When you've covered a complete line on the card, you've won the game.

In order to signal victory, the winner is required to volunteer to speak in class and work the word "Bingo" into their answer. The cards are then cleared and the game begins anew.

You will find that the game's presence can increase attention levels dramatically. You'll always want to listen carefully to hear who says "Bingo" after you've spoken in class.

Dear MAC: I am a first year student and I study so much that I never get any exercise and it makes me depressed. What can I do?

—MIND/BODY PROBLEM

Dear MIND/BODY: Next year take law school gym—you chase an ambulance around a track.

Dear MAC: The other night on the Paper Chase, the august Professor Kingsfield was seen with a Gilbert's under his arm. If outlines are good enough for Kingsfield, what has the entire over-65 club got against them?

—PERPLEXED

Dear PERPLEXED: It is important to distinguish between the make believe world of television and the make believe world of Hastings College of the Law. Professor Kingsfield does not really exist; he is a character portrayed by actor John Houseman. Similarly, the 65 club does not really exist—they are played by a representative of West's Publishing Company. Hence their opposition to Gilbert's—it cuts down text sales.

Calendar

WOODY ALLEN'S "GOD" AND "DEATH"—Two one-act comedies by the contemporary genius and academy award winner. "Death" is his absurd approach to the paranoia of life, the fear of death and the necessity of living in American society. Allen explodes the myth of God, life, theater and roast beef sandwiches in "God," a play within a play, within a play, within a play. Presented by the Indian Valley Colleges Players, directed by John Weldon. Arts and Humanities Studio Theatre, Indian Valley Colleges, Ignacio Blvd., Novato. Tickets: \$2.00 Information and reservations: (415) 883-2211.

OPENS: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2
THE RUN: 11/2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18 at 8:00 PM
Additional Matinee: 11/17 at 2:00 pm
CLOSES: SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 18

FILM LISTING - NOVEMBER
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO (UCSF), Cole Hall Auditorium, 513 Parnassus Avenue, San Francisco; 666-2019; Admission \$1.75/1.25 senior citizens

NOVEMBER
1 Wednesday
Small Change 7 & 9 pm
8 Wednesday
Fellini's Casanova 7 & 9:45 pm
9 Thursday
The Edge 7 & 9:30 pm
\$1.50 admission
10 Friday
Goodbye Girl 7 & 9 pm
15 Wednesday
Cria 7 & 9 pm
17 Friday
Coming Home 7 & 9 pm
18 Saturday
Coming Home 7 & 9 pm
29 Wednesday
Romeo & Juliet (Dance Version) 7 & 9:15 pm

For further information call: Sam Nuccio 666-2019

LIVING WELL IS THE BEST REVENGE LECTURE: ROSAMOND BERNIER NOVEMBER 9, 1978 at 10:30 a.m., Museum Rotunda

The Modern Art Council of the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art continues the "Living Well Is The Best Revenge" lecture series with Rosamond Bernier on November 9 at 10:30 a.m. As a friend to the "art stars" in France (Matisse, Picasso, Henry Moore), earlier in her career, she has established a reputation as a lively and dramatic speaker on the arts, fashion, and behind-the-scene insights. Her topic in November will be Paul Poiret, the famous French couturier who first liberated women from corsets, and who was a notable connoisseur at the turn of the century.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:
Modern Art Council
Dorothy Bannies 863-8800

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1978, 2:00 PM
INDIAN VALLEY COLLEGES FALL MUSIC CONCERT—The IVC Chamber Orchestra and Chorus will present a concert of classical and contemporary works, directed by Norman Masonson. At the Dance Palace, Point Reyes Station. \$2.50 general; \$1.50 students/senior citizens. Information: (415) 883-2211.

MARXIST STUDY

A lecture entitled, "Position of Black Workers in the Economy" will launch the Marxist Study Series winter semester on Wednesday, November 8, 7:45 pm at 522 Valencia Street in San Francisco.

The November 8th lecture, taught by Roscoe Proctor, will deal with how today's economic crisis, working conditions, recent affirmative action decisions and intensification of racism affects Black women and men. A program to meet these problems will also be discussed. Fee for this one night only lecture is \$1.50.

Continued From Page 2

ed, and difficult to reach during working hours. They are a bill collector's nightmare. Bank of America provided that it would issue student cards with a \$100 limit after an interview and verification of income. Processing time was as long as six months. The bank usually would raise your limit until you finished your education.

Security Pacific Bank will issue a \$100 limit to graduate students, with credit cards, with a disposable income requirement far less than B of A. A deposit relationship is not required. If a student will open a checking account a check guarantee card will also be provided. The check account will be "covered" against overdrafts by your \$500 credit line. As with B of A, an interview is required. Take along a registrar's letter with the school seal to verify student standing. Our student body cards don't Xerox well. As for income, whatever documentation you have and can bring in might speed up the process. Don't be embarrassed that you're not currently earning a lot since very little is required. Last year's tax return or the most recent check stub from part-time or summer work should do. According to the manager at 500 Golden Gate, no Hastings student should have an insurmountable problem because of income. Also, student loans and other aid are usually considered income for the purpose. Processing time is four weeks.

Wells Fargo has a special program for MasterCharge only. You must go

to the branch and submit a student application (you may have to ask an officer for one). A deposit account is not required. When you go to Wells Fargo the officer will verify your student status. There is no fixed income requirement. Wells Fargo states that if the applicant can enter and maintain standing at Hastings (and other similar institutions) they are obviously able to conduct their affairs competently, so the Bank does not dwell on tracking down exact sources of income for the sake of the file. The credit limit Wells Fargo uses for Graduate students is \$400, but the limit may be raised after a year of good performance. The student need only phone at that time to obtain a review of the account and a "raise." Check guarantee cards are available to students by arrangement with an officer at the branch. The MasterCharge card will cover your checking account against overdrafts to the extent of your available credit. Processing time is four weeks.

United California Bank has a Student card plan which is closer to Bank of America's and does not normally include check guarantee. Other banks are also near the school. Most people shop for banks based on personal convenience but don't let convenience tie you into an inferior arrangement.

A last word on the interview process. First impressions count, so you might want to dress formally. Calling ahead for an appointment will avoid delays and interruptions. Get the business card of your bank contact. Sooner or later you might need that person again for an auto loan, mortgage or bank reference. This applica-

tion process all supposes that the applicant has no established credit. All of the banks will decline the account should they discover that the applicant has a history of trouble in financial dealings. Previous revoked credit cards, checking accounts closed due to bounced checks, judgements outstanding and unpaid and other such activity in the past will probably preclude consideration of the account.

It doesn't take much of this sort of thing to result in a decline. A legitimate dispute is one thing, but any hint of a cavalier attitude in the record, or during the interview is the end of that application. Many people make comments in the course of applying for credit that make the difference in how they are treated. Personal impressions can be decisive.



1st and 2nd Year Law Students

For \$100 fully credited to your senior year bar review course, you receive:

1. FREE BAR/BRI Outlines to Use Throughout Law School
2. FREE Admission to All Video and Audio Showings of our Review Course Lectures in Our Offices.
3. FROZEN Price for Your Senior Bar Review Course.
4. DISCOUNTS on All Special 1st and 2nd Year Programs Designed for Law School Course Analysis and Review.

barbri
BAR REVIEW

See Your Campus Representative for an Application or Call any BAR/BRI Office.

The BAR/BRI Early Sign-Up deadline has been extended to November 1. A deposit of \$25 will freeze the tuition at \$375 plus a \$40 refundable book deposit. After November 1 the tuition will be \$425 plus a \$40 refundable book deposit.

UNCLASSIFIED

Condo for lowering the cost of SKI TRIP, leave note in locker 663.

Pattie, How many did he really consume?

Be ALERT
We need more LERTS

Harry Sherr gets the John Travolta award for the light as Fred Astaire dancing Saturday night sighed, the woman with the shoulders

To: His Holiness
Thank you deeply for naming me Honorary Armenian at the Centennial Dinner. I have only the fondest thoughts about ASS, and am certainly willing to start at the bottom and work my way up. Long live the Armenian Students Society.

Save a tree Eat a Beaver

FUN PURCHASE FOR \$15 EACH:
UNICYCLE & POLES
PACHINKO—LARGE SIZE (AS IS)
COME TO ROOM 10—Pat

Patti, I need you, I want you signed,
Not yet 65E.R.



Notice

TWENTY FIVE WOMEN CANDIDATES
IN SAN FRANCISCO ELECTIONS

MEET THEM THURSDAY, NOV. 2
3:30 at the MEZZANINE (1M)

WINE AND CHEESE FOLLOWING THE
MEETING*****
SPONSORED BY THE HASTINGS
WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Candidate for ASSESSOR:
AMY SOTOMAYOR O'BRIEN
Director of Assessment Services
Assessor's Office

Candidate for COMMUNITY COLLEGE
BOARD: LILLIAN KWOK SING,
Attorney, Hastings Alumnus

Candidates for BOARD OF EDUCA-
TION:

LUCILLE ABRAHAMSON, Incumbent
ROSARIO ANAYA, Director,
Mission Language and Vocational
School

JULE JOHNSON, Incumbent
MYRA KOPF, Education Consultant

Candidates for CHARTER
COMMISSION:

REBECCA BEZEMEK, Research
Consultant

BERNICE BIGGS, Educator
AGNES CAHN, Commission

ELLA CAHN

CARMEN ESTRADA, Attorney,
Hastings Alumnus
RITA GORDON, Government
Research Consultant

ELLI GUMP, Attorney
JEANE HANDELSMAN, Public Rela-
tions

DAISIE FLOR HARRISON,
Community Relations

SUE HESTOR, Attorney

PAT JACKSON, Training Dir.

NANCY KELLY, County Hospital
Secretary

MARJORIE MARTIN, Real Estate

CLARISSA McMAHON, Attorney,
Retired

SYLVIA ANTHONY NEWMAN, Retir-
ed Superior Court Clerk

PAT SCHULTZ, Legislative Con-
sultant

MARIAN SWARTZBERG, Homemaker
HELEN TINNEY, Housewife

***Don't forget ROSE BIRD!



happy halloween

Hastings Law News



J.E. Aeliot Boswell

Editor in Chief

STAFF AND CONTRIBUTORS

Lisa Bassis
Michael Barquera
Gary Bennett
Dana Cole
Lisa Hart
Allen R. King

Alan Kolling
Jules Krage
La Vonne Reimer
Erma Simms
Michael B. Scott
Stephen E. Taylor
Seyda Varol

Malcolm Kirschner



The **Hastings Law News** as the Hastings student legal publication serving the entire legal community, serves as a platform for the expression of student opinion, a mechanism for enhanced communication between Hastings and the organized bar, and as a public forum for articles written by students, faculty, staff, and outside contributors. The 1976-77 volume was designated the Best Overall Law School Newspaper in California by the American Bar Association.

We encourage publication of divergent viewpoints. All manuscripts or letters must be typed double spaced on white bond. The **Hastings Law News** assumes no responsibility upon receipt of unsolicited manuscripts. © Copyright 1978 by the **Hastings Law News**. All rights are reserved. Postage paid at San Francisco, California.

The **Hastings Law News** is represented nationally for advertising by the National Entertainment Advertising Service [NEAS]. Additional Advertising representation is provided by [CASS]. Advertising inquiries should be directed to Advertising Director, Hastings Law News, Hastings College of the Law, University of California, 198 McAllister Street, San Francisco, California 94102.

The opinions expressed are those of the author. All submitted manuscripts must be signed by the author. The views expressed are not necessarily those of the **Hastings Law News** or of Hastings College of the Law. This is a student publication.

Typesetting What's Your Line Graphics

HASTINGS LAW NEWS

Hastings College of the Law
University of California
198 McAllister St.
San Francisco, Ca. 94102

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID

San Francisco, Ca.
Permit No. 10286